

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-30, and 32-35 are pending. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-30, and 32-35 are rejected. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. No new matter has been added herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The present Office Action rejected Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gvili (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,593) (hereinafter referred to as ‘Gvili’), in view of Fowler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,979) (hereinafter referred to as ‘Fowler’), McClure et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,303) (hereinafter referred to as ‘McClure’), Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,475) (hereinafter referred to as ‘Murphy’), and Weindorf (U.S. Patent No. 6,762,741). Applicants has reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-24 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Gvili taken alone or in combination with Fowler, McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf.

The present Office Action rejected Claims 25-27 and 35 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler, McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf. Applicants has reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 25-27 and 35 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Fowler in view of McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf.

Additionally, the present Office Action rejected Claims 28-30, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler, in view of McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf (as applied to Claim 25). Applicants has reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 28-30, and 32-34, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Fowler taken alone or in combination with McClure, Murphy, Gvili, and Weindorf.

“As reiterated by the Supreme Court in KSR, the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries” including “[a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art” (MPEP 2141(II)). “In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious” (emphasis in original; MPEP 2141.02(I)). Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art” (emphasis added; MPEP 2141(III)).

Independent Claims 1, 12, and 25

Applicants respectfully point out that amended independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 each recite that the present invention includes an integrated guidance system. In particular, each of the amended independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 recites that the present invention includes, in part:

...wherein said housing has a first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from said housing.

Support for these amendments may be found on at least pages 15-16 and Figures 4-7 of the specification.

The claimed embodiments of Claims 1, 12, and 25 pertain to an integrated guidance system. In particular, independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 each recite that the system comprises, in part, a housing having a first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion. These wing-shaped portions are configured to protect a connector for a cable, wherein the connector extends from the housing.

Applicants respectfully note that Gvili taken alone or in combination with Fowler, McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf does not teach nor suggest a housing includes a first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from the housing as claimed in independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 of the present invention. In contrast, Gvili, Fowler, McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf remain silent as to a housing including a first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from the housing.

Applicants submit that the invention as a whole, particularly the feature of a “first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from said housing,” as claimed. The Examiner asserts this claimed feature would be

obvious, however does not provide why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner provides McClure as teaching a square shape and indicates it would have been obvious to provide a “first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from said housing,” as claimed in view of the square shape of McClure. Applicants do not understand a “first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from said housing,” as obvious in view of a square shape. In addition, McClure is silent to protecting a cable connector, as claimed.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Gvili taken alone or in combination with Fowler, McClure, Murphy, and Weindorf does not anticipate or render obvious the system of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 12, and 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 overcome the cited references and are in a condition for allowance. As such, Claims 2-3, and 5-11, which depend on independent Claim 1 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13-14, and 16-24 which depend on independent Claim 12 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 26-30 and 32-35 are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of the Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-30, and 32-35.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: June 27, 2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398
123 Westridge Dr.
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500